UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,285	03/12/2004	David W. Farchmin	11003.00026.03AB047	1291

7590 12/22/2010

Susan M. Donahue
Rockwell Automation Inc. 704-P
1201 South Second Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204-2496

EXAMINER	
GOODCHILD, WILLIAM J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2433	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,285	FARCHMIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD	2433	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *54 and 56-73* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *54 and 56-73* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 54, 56-59 and 61-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanikoshi et al., (US Patent No. 5,598,572, (hereinafter Tanikoshi), and further in view of Eidson, (US Patent No. 5,978,753).

Regarding claim 54, Tanikoshi discloses a method for use with at least first and second resources to be arranged to perform a process within a space [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 42-48], the method for validating likely correct resource communications and comprising the steps of:

providing a rule set including rules that indicate probable relative resource positions [Tanikoshi, column 2, lines 39-61];

identifying the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 26-56];

determining if the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources are consistent with the rule set [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 42-56]; and

where, the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources are inconsistent with the rule set, performing a secondary function [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 2-56].

Tanikoshi does not specifically disclose specifying that a first resource communicates with a second resource.

However, Eidson, in the same field of endeavor discloses devices connected to a network and sharing packets with each other (peer to peer) [Eidson, column 1, lines 18-35].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the devices communicating with each other in order to provide for allowing devices and controllers to keep in contact with each other to allow each unit / device to have knowledge of the other devices when one device can perform its functions faster and with less user interaction with that knowledge. It would have been obvious to combine Eidson with Tanikoshi as both arts relate to identifying and controlling other devices on the network

Regarding claim 56, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the rule set indicates a maximum distance between the second resource and a reference point within the space

such that, when the distance between the reference point and the second resource is greater than the maximum distance, the relative juxtapositions of the first and second resources are inconsistent with the rule set [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-41].

Regarding claim 57, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the reference point is the location of the first resource [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56].

Regarding claim 58, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the secondary function is to indicate that the specified communication is improbable [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-41].

Regarding claim 59, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the method is performed in real time as a resource is added to a sub-set of resources to perform the process [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 42-48].

Regarding claim 60, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the method is performed in batch after a sub-set of resources has been configured[Eidson, column 2, lines 43-55, column 1, lines 43-47] to perform the process [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 8-48].

Regarding claim 61, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses correlating logical network addresses with space locations [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-37] and wherein the step of

identifying the relative positions of the first and second resources includes specifying a network address for each of the first and second resources [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54], determining the locations of the first and second resources from the correlated information [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54 and column 2, lines 56-61] and using the first and second resource locations to determine relative positions of the first and second resources [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56].

Regarding claim 62, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the environment includes an automated manufacturing facility [Tanikoshi, abstract].

Regarding claim 63, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses a method for use with at least first and second resources to be arranged to perform a process within an environment, the method for validating likely correct resource communications and comprising the steps of:

providing a rule set including rules that indicate probable relative resource positions [Tanikoshi, column 2, lines 39-61];

specifying a first spatial relationship between first and second resources [Eidson, column 1, 18-23];

determining if the specified spatial relationship between the first and second resources is consistent with the rule set [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56]; and

where the specified spatial relationship between the first and second resources is inconsistent with the rule set, performing a secondary function [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 42-56].

Regarding claim 64, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the environment includes an automated manufacturing facility [Tanikoshi, abstract].

Regarding claim 65, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses a method for use with a plurality of resources to be arranged to perform a process, the method for validating likely correct resource communication and comprising the steps of:
providing a rule set including rules that indicate probable relative resource positions [Tanikoshi, column 2, lines 39-61];
correlating logical network addresses with environment locations [Eidson, column 1, lines 18-23];
specifying first and second network addresses for a first and a second resources, respectively [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-37];
specifying that the first resource communicates with the second resource [Eidson, column 1, lines 18-23];
identifying the network addresses of the first and second resources [Eidson, column 1, lines 18-54];

using the network addresses of the first and second resources to determine the relative positions of the first and second resources [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54 and column 2, lines 56-61];

determining if the first and second resource relative positions are consistent with the rule set [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56]; and

where the relative positions of the first and second resources are inconsistent with the rule set, performing a secondary function [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56].

Regarding claim 66, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the rule set indicates a maximum distance between the first and second resources such that, when the distance between the first and second resources is greater than the maximum distance, the relative positions of the first and second resources are inconsistent with the rule set [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56].

Regarding claim 67, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the step of performing a secondary function includes indicating an improbable resource configuration [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56].

Regarding claim 68, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses a method for use with a plurality of resources to be linked via a network within an environment to perform a process and a processor running a program to control the process, the program including at least

one of a program input and a program output tag for each of the resources, the method for facilitating association of tags and resources and comprising the steps of:

associating a space within the environment with the process [Tanikoshi, column 2, lines 39-61];

providing at least a first information device that includes a processor [Tanikoshi, column 2, lines 39-61];

determining the location of the information device within the environment [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 42-56]; and

when the information device is proximate at least a sub-space within the space, using the processor to automatically perform the steps of [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 25-56]:

identifying the resources to be positioned within the sub-space [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54];

identifying the tags associated with the resources [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54]; and

indicating the tags associated with the resources [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54].

Regarding claim 69, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses identifying the resource to the network and indicating one of the tags via the information device that is to be associated with the resource [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54] and, wherein, the method further includes the step of associating the identified resource with the indicated tag [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54].

Regarding claim 70, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the step of identifying the resource includes linking the resource to the network [Eidson, column 1, lines 26-54].

Regarding claim 71, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the information device includes a display [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 8-19] and wherein the step of identifying the tags includes providing a list of the tags and the step of indicating one of the tags includes selecting one of the tags from the list [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 8-56].

Regarding claim 72, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein each of the resources is associated with a network address [Eidson, column 1, li18-23] and wherein the step of associating includes determining the resource address and correlating the resource address with the tag [Eidson, column 1, li18-23].

Regarding claim 73, Tanikoshi-Eidson further discloses wherein the process is repeated for each resource to be located within the sub-space [Tanikoshi, column 4, lines 8-56].

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular paragraphs / columns and line numbers in the reference(s) applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the cited passages as taught by the prior art or relied upon by the examiner.

Should applicant amend the claims of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that applicant clearly indicate the portion(s) of applicant's specification that support the amended claim language for ascertaining the metes and bounds of applicant's claimed invention

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLIAM J. GOODCHILD whose telephone number is (571)270-1589. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday / 8:00 AM - 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on (571) 272-7304. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/WJG/
12/05/2010

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445